

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-15 remain in the application along with newly added dependent claim 16.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested for claims 1-15 and consideration is requested for claim 16.

Figure 1 is now labeled as Prior Art as requested by the Examiner.

Reference characters a-d are now identified in the specification.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failing to show excitation pulses, gradients, and the measured signals for separate materials.

This objection is respectfully traversed. The claims are all directed to a Method of magnetic resonance imaging and not to structure for magnetic resonance imaging. Indeed, the structure for carrying out the claimed method is well-known and commercially available.

According to MPEP 601.01(f), it is the USPTO practice to treat an application with process or method claims as an application for which a drawing is not necessary for an understanding of the invention under 35 USC 113. However, drawings have been submitted to aid in an understanding of the invention. The pulse sequence including gradients for SSFP imaging is known. What is not known is the use of phase sensitive SSFP magnetic resonance imaging, as claimed, for separating material.

The Examiner objects under 35 USC 132 to the amendment filed with the original application as introducing new matter into the specification.

Enclosed herewith is a Supplemental Declaration of the inventors that the amendment filed with the original application is part of the disclosure of the invention. See MPEP 714.01(e)II.

Since the amendment filed with the application constitutes part of the disclosure and is not new matter, the specification has been amended to include the material disclosed in the amendment.

Claims 1-15 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Hargreaves et al. 6,452,387.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The cited Hargreaves et al. '387 patent is concerned with accelerating or catalyzing the transient response in steady state magnetic resonance sequences by determining magnetization magnitude of the steady state condition, and then scaling magnetization along an axis to approximate the determined magnetization magnitude. The patent is not concerned with material separation by measuring refocused MRI

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

A Replacement Sheet is submitted in which Fig. 1 is labeled as Prior Art.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

signals with the phases of the measured signals being used to separate materials, as is the claimed invention.

In addition, Dr. Hargreaves and Dr. Vasanawala, the present inventors and applicants, are co-inventors and co-applicants of the cited '387 patent. Enclosed herewith is a Declaration of Dr. Hargreaves and Dr. Vasanawala that any description or suggestion of the claimed invention in the '387 patent is attributable solely to them and not to Dr. John M. Pauly and to Dr. Dwight G. Nishimura. All four of the named patentees are employees of Stanford University and are part of the Magnetic Resonance Systems Research Laboratory (MRSRL).

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the drawings are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d), that the specification is in compliance with 35 USC 132, and that claims 1-15 along with newly added dependent claim 16 are patentable over the cited art. It is requested that the application be advanced to issue.

Should the Examiner have any question regarding the present amendment, a telephone call to the undersigned attorney is requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Henry K. Woodward  
Reg. No. 22,672

P.O. Box 778  
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778  
(650) 961-8300